DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 167 CS 502 842

AUTHOR DeVito, Joseph A.
TITLE Educational Responsibilities to the Gay and Lesbian Student.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; Civil Liberties; *Civil Rights; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Higher Education; *Homosexuality; *Lesbianism; Minority Groups; Self Concept; Social Bias; Social Discrimination; Stereotypes; *Teacher Responsibility

ABSTRACT

Administrators and teachers should ensure that gay and lesbian students are accorded rights equal to those accorded to heterosexual students. Administrators have the responsibility to find and hire gay and lesbian teachers and to secure for them total equality with heterosexual teachers as well as a supportive, accepting atmosphere; under such conditions, gay and lesbian teachers can serve as effective role models for gay and lesbian students. Teachers and writers can approach the treatment of gay and lesbian students by focusing on promoting equal rights for all persons, by helping students to develop a positive self-concept about their identities, and by promoting mutual understanding and effective communication among students. Teachers should develop an intellectual and emotional recognition of gay and lesbian existence, history, and behavior; should avoid negative stereotypes of gays and lesbians; and should avoid the heterosexual presumption in teaching and writing, striving to eliminate discriminatory language usage and to prohibit abusive classroom criticism of the gay and lesbian cause. Teachers should also recognize the influence of affectional preference on communication with regard to such variables as self-disclosure, language usage, message encoding and decoding, contextual and subcultural differences, field of experience, and relational development and deterioration. (GT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184167

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Educational Responsibilities to the Gay and Lesbian Student

Joseph A. DeVito

Queens College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph A. DeVito

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502942

Educational Responsibilities to the Gay and Lesbian Student

Joseph A. DeVito
Queens College

Some years ago we recognized that not all our students and readers were white: some were black, some were Oriental, some were Chicano. More recently we recognized that not everyone was male; there were women sitting in our classes and reading our books. Now it needs to be recognized that not all our students and readers are heterosexuals: some are gay, some are lesbian.[1]

I do not mention blacks and women to imply that the cases are identical. In actual fact, they are quite different. Blacks and women, for example, are not told that they are sick, maladjusted, and degenerate because they are black or because they are women. Gay men and lesbians are told--by peers, by the media, and by teachers and textbook authors--that they are sick because they are homosexual. Blacks and women are not thrown out of their families (condemned by their parents and abandoned by their children) because they are black or because they are women; gay men and lesbians often are.[2] Instead, I mention the case of blacks and women to emphasize that discrimination against the homosexual is a human rights issue just as it is when the discrimination is focused against blacks or women or, in fact, any group--the Puerto Ricans in New York, the Mexicans in the Southwest, the aged, the blind; to emphasize that prejudice in any form is destructive to both sides and to society in general, to emphasize that discrimination, despite its deep-seated roots--can be combatted and in time reduced, maybe even eliminated.

In many ways the educational responsibilities to the gay and lesbian student must logically begin with the administrator. Administrators have the responsibility for providing an atmosphere in which gay and lesbian teachers, counselors, deans, and the like are permitted and encouraged to function as gays and lesbians.[3] In this the administrator's responsibility is no less than it is in regard to women and blacks.

This responsibility towards the gay and lesbian is at once easier and more difficult to comply with than the responsibility towards other minority groups. Whereas administrators in many instances have to locate and recruit women and blacks, there is--you can be sure--a pretty fair sampling of gay men and lesbians already on campus and the difficult problems of quotas and what constitutes affirmative action do not have to be dealt with--at least not as a first priority. Instead, the task is to provide an atmosphere that is conducive to gay men and lesbian teachers functioning as gay men and lesbians, an atmosphere which would be supportive of their coming out of the closet should they wish to. This responsibility will not be easy to fulfill. The social pressures from uninformed and/or homophobic parents, alumni, students, and the community in general are not easy to face.[4] But then no prejudice is easy to deal with and confronting bigotry appears the only appropriate strategy. As academicians we have the obligation to expose untruths and injustices wherever found. When these are found in our own schools, departments, and classrooms then it becomes even more important to confront and expose such prejudice directly and immediately.

Gay men and lesbian students need role models just as do women and blacks or, in fact, like anyone. Because teachers are among the most effective role models, administrators and the college community as a whole need

to make a special effort to provide such models. Further, these role models should be representative of the gay and lesbian community as a whole and should be open and out of the closet. Otherwise, their function as role models will be severely restricted. This is not to say that closet gays and lesbians cannot function as effective role models; in many cases they can and do. Some gay and lesbian students are able to identify the gay and lesbian teachers and may seek them out for both personal and professional guidance. Yet, we also need to provide role models that are more clearly and generally identifiable as gays and lesbians and with a gay and lesbian life style--both for the benefit of the gay and lesbian students but also as a rebuttal to the negative stereotypes so long ingrained in heterosexuals and homosexuals alike.

No administrator would be able to hold his or her job for very long if the benefits for blacks were not equal to those for whites, if the benefits for women were not equal to those for men. But the gay teacher is denied the very benefits that he or she would receive if straight. For example, health insurance is denied to the gay teacher's mate and transportation expenses for relocating are denied to a lover but normally paid for a husband or wife. Similarly, the heterosexual's mate is provided with free or reduced tuition at the college or university. The homosexual's mate is denied such benefits. The children of a homosexual faculty member's mate are denied the very same benefits that would be granted to the children of a heterosexual faculty member's husband or wife. And this is true regardless of how long or how happy the respective relationships are. A one-year heterosexual marriage entitles the husband or wife to these various benefits; a twenty-year homosexual union entitles the mate to nothing.

Such differences must not be allowed to be trivialized by those who rigidly hold on to and enforce such distinctions and differences. Consider their implications. Consider, for example, if a black teacher's husband or wife was not covered by the health insurance plan and if the teacher's contract explicitly stated that only white couples were entitled to relocation allowances, that only white mates and children of white marriages were entitled to reduced or free tuition. Recognize that such practices are discriminatory and clearly say--as in Animal Farm--we are all equal but heterosexuals are more equal than others. If the gay and lesbian teacher is forced to function in second class--and come to be grateful for being allowed to teach in the first place--then we have something akin to slavery. Thus, the administrator's task is not only to find and hire gay and lesbian teachers but to secure for them total equality and an atmosphere that is supportive and accepting. Such an atmosphere will prove beneficial not only to the gay and lesbian teacher but to students and to society as a whole.

As teachers and writers our concern should be two-fold. First, we should be concerned with the rights of gays and lesbians who are our students and readers. You may teach a class that is all male or all female. You may teach a class that is all white or all black or all Chicano. But you will probably never teach a class that is all straight. Second, we should be concerned with the education of all our students--gay and straight--regarding such issues as, for example, the stereotypes of the gay and lesbian that exist in the minds of our students and readers that are far removed from reality and that are damaging to self-actualization and to meaningful interaction and communication. These stereotypes (the maladjustment, the

creativity, the inability to engage in permanent relationships, the artistic sense, the undependability, the preoccupation with sex, the sensitivity), it should be clear, exist not only in the minds of the heterosexual students but also in the minds of the homosexual students.[5] Such stereotypes prevent meaningful intrapersonal communication in the gay and lesbian and meaningful interpersonal communication, whether gay-to gay or gay-and-straight. Part of our function must be to help the students to self actualize his or her potential. If we fail at this then we have failed in a large part of our responsibility as educators.

These concerns may be approached through three major goals on which we as teachers and writers should focus. These goals (actually responsibilities) are considered in relation to the gay and lesbian student-reader but are really basic rights, applicable to all persons. I stress the case of the gay and lesbian because it is to this group to whom these rights are currently being denied.

First, I think the teacher has a responsibility to present a case for and promote equal human rights for all persons. Much as the teacher has an obligation not to denigrate women or blacks or Chicanos, the teacher also has an obligation not to denigrate gays and lesbians. But the responsibility goes beyond the avoidance of the negative to the clear affirmation that equal human rights is not some abstract irrelevance but that it clearly and specifically applies to gays and lesbians as well as to any and all other groups. It involves a recognition, an acceptance, and an active affirmation of equality not only for the individual specific student but equality also for gay men and lesbians as a group and for the gay and lesbian life style.

Second, the teacher has a responsibility to assist students to develop a positive self concept about their basic, unchanging, and unchangeable identities. This means that the teacher has the responsibility to encourage women to have a more positive self-image about their "womanness" and to encourage blacks to have a more positive self-image about their "blackness." It is similarly the responsibility of the teacher to encourage gays and lesbians to have a more positive self-image about their "gayness" and their "lesbianness," to see, for example, that homosexuality is not a deficiency or a maladjustment, that it is instead a positive and legitimate life style, an approach to a loving and fulfilling life--no better than and no worse than but fully equal to heterosexuality. This is an extremely difficult but crucial task since the self-concept of the gay man and lesbian--to a greater extent than that of any other group--is consistently attacked--not only by Anita Bryant and similar types but by often well-intentioned but ignorant parents, relatives, and friends.[6]

Most gays and lesbians in college--and the situation seems even more difficult for high school and elementary school students--are going through difficult times and despite the fact that great advances have been made in the last ten years, we still live in a negative, repressive, homophobic atmosphere where the student is made to believe that he or she is sick, degenerate, in need of religious saving and psychiatric help, and a disappointment to his or her parents, friends, and church.[7] It is the teacher's responsibility (though not the teacher's alone) to provide a positive and supportive atmosphere where the student may feel that he or she may excel, may lead a happy and productive life, and may be gay or lesbian.

Third, the teacher has a responsibility to promote mutual understanding

and effective communication among students. If such effective communication is to take place then it is essential that the nongay student come to understand and accept the equality of the gay and lesbian student and of the gay life style as a legitimate alternative to the heterosexual life style.[8] There must be an assumption of equality for there to be effective and mutually beneficial communication. This does not mean that the heterosexual student should see homosexuality as an alternative life style for himself or herself. Rather, it means that he or she appreciates that the gay and lesbian life style may serve as an effective and equally legitimate alternative for others.

For some these three responsibilities will prove difficult to accept. Consider, how difficult it would have been to accept these same propositions about blacks 100 years ago or even 50 years ago, not to mention that a good number of our population will still not accept them. With propositions of this nature there are levels of acceptance rather than simple acceptance-or-rejection. These three propositions might best be viewed as ultimate goals rather than as immediate ones that can be internalized tomorrow. These are difficult to accept for homosexuals as well as for heterosexuals. Both homosexuals and heterosexuals have grown up in essentially the same environment and have been taught essentially the same values and beliefs and so it should not be surprising to find that many homosexuals cannot accept (viscerally) their own equality with heterosexuals. I'm sure, however, that in the not-too-distant future these propositions will seem mild at best.

Specific Guildelines for the Educator

Increased awareness and concern for the gay and lesbian student-reader

need to be translated into actual practice; for it to have any significant effect on the student, on the academic experience, and on the community as a whole, it needs to be actualized. Here I sketch, in a preliminary way, some of the guidlines that might be useful.

Recognition of Gay and Lesbian Existence. Perhaps the first guideline for the educator is to recognize emotionally as well as intellectually, in behavior as well as in thought, gay and lesbian existence. We are all familiar with the statistics on the numbers of gays and lesbians. Depending on the method in which the data are collected and on the definition as to what constitutes a gay and a lesbian, the statistics seem to range from 4 to 25 percent. The difficulty of securing accurate statistics on such an issue should be obvious and in all likelihood the statistics that are available probably reflect a much smaller percentage than actually exists.[9] But whether there are only 4 percent, 25 percent, or a great deal more (or less) should not really matter in terms of our recognition that there is a sizable minority of persons who do not fit into the majority culture's model of heterosexuality.

It should be recognized further that not only do gays and lesbians exist but that they have a history. That history includes the murder of homosexuals by the majority culture--by burning, by stoning, by hanging--imprisonment, castration, expulsion from school, job, church, family, and armed forces, commitment to insane asylums, and general ostracism.[10] But that history also records the contributions made by homosexuals to art, to music, to science, to literature, and, in fact, to any and all areas of knowledge.[11] In communication and rhetoric, for example, it would be impossible to write its history without including the important contributions of its homosexuals; from Plato and Socrates, through Francis Bacon,

to contemporary researchers and writers, the contributions have been undeniable.

Those who would argue that the ideas, insights, and contributions of these theorists can be appreciated apart from their homosexuality are denying the seminal role that the homosexuality of these persons played in their lives. No idea exists apart from the experiences of the individual; no idea exists apart from the context in which it is given birth. Those experiences and that context are homosexual. Their homosexuality was an integral part of their day-to-day lives, of their total emotional and intellectual existence. No one hides his or her private life for 10, 20, 30, or 40 years without that hiding, that fear of discovery and rejection of peers and family, manifesting itself in each and every aspect of that person's life. To deny that an individual's homosexuality is significant is, in many instances, an attempt to deny the legitimacy and the equality of that homosexuality.[12]

But most important, the gays and lesbians that we as teachers and writers should be concerned with most are in our classrooms.[13] If even the most conservative statistics are used, then in every classroom there is at least one gay or lesbian student. In all likelihood there are several, even many. If a textbook is used by 50,000 students, then the number of gays and lesbians reading it number in the thousands regardless of how you compute their number.[14]

Once we recognize that gays and lesbians do in fact exist (and that existence will invariably become more and more visible over the next several years), we need to recognize that there is such a thing as gay and lesbian behavior and that these behaviors are different in essential respects from

heterosexual behaviors--a difference to which researchers need to direct energies to identify and describe.

The same is true for gay and lesbian relationships and for the gay and lesbian life style as a whole. Too often the heterosexual community assumes and teaches (and, unfortunately, part of the gay community has learned) that it is the heterosexual relationship and the heterosexual life style that everyone is to model. Thus, such issues as fidelity, male bonding, female bonding, sexuality, permanent relationships, sex role distinctions, family, marriage, division of labor on the basis of sex and the like are heterosexual concepts or are defined from a heterosexual perspective and are not necessarily applicable to gays and lesbians. If we are at all concerned with relational communication then it should be clearly recognized that as a field we are building a model that is heterosexual and that is in many ways inappropriate and inapplicable to the gay male and lesbian.

Avoidance of Stereotypes. The teacher and writer have to be especially careful to avoid the stereotypes of gays and lesbians. Thus, we need to realize and act upon the knowledge that not all gay males are effeminate and not all lesbians are masculine; in fact, Masters and Johnson in their Homosexuality in Perspective have reported that there is no correlation between lesbianism and musculinity in women and between gayness and effeminacy in men. Not only do these stereotypes exist in the popular mind; unfortunately, these stereotypes have been internalized by many gays and lesbians as well as by heterosexuals. One of the consequences of this is that many gay males and lesbians cannot identify with their gay and lesbian community because they have internalized these negative stereotypes and resent being associated with them.

If the sexual behaviors of gays and lesbians were plotted the result would be the familiar bell shaped curve which would be similar in many respects to that of the heterosexual men and women. The curves would differ in their measures of central tendency on some variables but it would be the great degree of overlapping of the two curves that would prove most illuminating and most surprising to those unfamiliar with such issues.

Gays and lesbians are not maladjusted.[15] Needless to say, some have psychological problems but these problems are not the result of their homosexuality but rather the result of society's responses to the homosexual and lesbian. This distinction, I think, underlies the American Psychiatric Association's "non-sickness" position and should be obvious to anyone who has lived in a homophobic society. Let me make this more specific. The unhappiness, the guilt, the shame that the gay male and lesbian feel are not the result of their homosexuality but of society's reaction to that homosexuality. A large and powerful part of that reaction is made up of the attitudes and behaviors of teachers--from elementary through high school and into college and graduate school--and writers who reinforce these negative attitudes and perpetuate these stereotypes.

Avoidance of the Heterosexual Presumption. In addition to avoiding the homosexual stereotypes, we need to avoid the heterosexual presumption. There is clearly a presumption of whiteness, maleness, and heterosexuality in our culture and more specifically in our teaching and in our writings. The hypothetical individual is a white heterosexual male and perhaps the best evidence of this presumption is that when the individual in question does not fit into this model, special linguistic tags are felt to be necessary and so we say, for example, the black engineer, the woman doctor, the

gay teacher, the lesbian reporter.

In avoiding this presumption we need to recognize a few facts. For example, not all relationships are heterosexual. Some relationships are homosexual. Marriage is not the only state to which one should aspire. It is not the only state that persons over 30 have to enter or should enter. The single state and the homosexual union are alternatives; they are not substitutes for those who could not enter into a heterosexual union. They are equally valid alternatives.

The sexist nature of language has been documented in a number of works over the past ten years.[16] In this work it has been amply demonstrated that there is indeed a presumption of maleness and that language as used does in fact discriminate against women. But it also discriminated against gays and lesbians. In addition to language being sexist, it is also heterosexist. Just as the hypothetical individual is always male, the hypothetical couple is always heterosexual, always male-and-female. Two persons who love each other, for example, are invariably portrayed as male and female unless the love is qualified a hundred times as non-sexual. But gender combinations do not have to be "he and she." They may be "she and she" and "he and he"; "woman and woman" is as acceptable a gender combination as any other.

Similarly, relational terms often discriminate against gays and lesbians. Terms such as "[illegible]e," "husband," and "wife"--to name just a few--are applicable only to heterosexual unions. The two men who have been together for 20 years are not related as husband and wife; they are not married. In gay parlance they are "lovers" but as popularly used and understood that term is too general and does not include the years of commitment, the permanency of the relationship, and a host of other dimensions

that are included in both the denotative and connotative meanings of the term "marriage."

This presumption of heterosexuality is further supported by the acceptability and sanctioning of the homophobic response. In a classroom normally devoted to an expression of liberal philosophies, the gay and lesbian cause in general are seen as somehow not fitting into the appropriate mold and are consequently fair game for abusive criticism. In this the classroom is, unfortunately, no different from the television talk show which seeks to put homosexuality on exhibit or the situation comedy show where humor is extracted from someone's real life pain. The implicit argument is that since homosexuality is wrong (morally and legally) it is permissible to denigrate gays and lesbians and to even deny gays and lesbians certain rights. And this, of course, is the very argument that has been used throughout history and is today being used to support such discriminatory practices as entrapment, denial of housing accommodations, and denial of job opportunities and promotions, seen most obviously in the legal exclusion of gays and lesbians from teaching, from the military, from the police and fire departments, and from the clergy.

These discriminatory and exclusionary tactics when applied in the classroom, as they often are, are even more reprehensible when it is realized that the gays and the lesbians in the classroom--teachers as well as students--are often prevented from defending themselves and their fellow members for fear that reprisals may be taken against them. Thus, for example, one teacher may hesitate to support the rights of another gay teacher for fear that this may well brand the first as a gay or lesbian and hence as an "undesirable." The Briggs Amendment and similar proposals in various

states would make it illegal for a homosexual to teach and at the same time makes it illegal for anyone to support the right of the homosexual to teach. So not only does it prevent homosexuals from teaching, it also prevents anything from being done to help them. It is not surprising that the Briggs Amendment was defeated in California. It is surprising and scary when we realize that thousands actively supported the Amendment and that its equivalent is currently on the books in Oklahoma.

Recognition of the Influence of Affectional Preference on Communication. As persons interested particularly in the study of communication, we need to recognize that there are many ways in which affectional preference seems to influence communication processes and outcomes. I should like to express just a few of the relationships which seem worthy of study and research. All are offered in the nature of hypotheses.

Self Considerations. It should be obvious that in a society where the gay male and lesbian are regarded as degenerate and maladjusted that their self-concept will differ from their heterosexual counterparts. Insofar as self-concept influences communication, then gay and lesbian communications will differ from heterosexual communications. Self-disclosure is perhaps the most interesting area and has only recently been touched upon by writers who have addressed the issue from the point of view of their own coming out of the closet. Merle Miller's On Being Different is perhaps one of the best examples.[17] But the homosexual's self-disclosure as a communication process is going to be very different from the heterosexual's self-disclosures and related variables such as trust, friendship, and love will also differ.

Language. The most obvious variable and the one which even the un-

observant can observe is that of language.[18] Each subculture has its own sublanguage which functions as a means for group identification and for the exclusion of nonmembers. At the same time, the sublanguage of the group gives an excellent indication of what is and what is not important to the subculture, to its values, and to its attitutdes. But perhaps the most important aspect is that the sublanguage often gives clues as to what the subculture members think of themselves. When the gay lexicon includes such high frequency terms as fag, dyke, queen, auntie, and fag hag, it becomes obvious that there is a great deal of internal and internalized discrimination. To argue (as some have done) that it is permissible and even healthy for group members to use derogatory terms in reference to themselves--on the theory that it is healthy to laugh at oneself--seems absurd and seems only to solidify in their own minds the negative attitudes and stereotypes of the majority culture. The connotative meaning systems for these terms--among gays and among straights--will be very similar, to my mind, and in that similarity will be found evidence for the negative effect of such terms.

Message Formulation and Encoding. Much as we receive what is useful to us or what we need, we also operate our message formulation and encoding system on similar principles. Because of such principles as immanent reference (we are always talking about ourselves and our immediate environment), determinism (all messages are motivated), and recurrence (we repeat those messages that are particularly important and meaningful to us), the messages formulated by gays and lesbians and by straights will invariably be different. Much as our messages are influenced by our gender (or perhaps by the differential learning of the sexes), they are also influenced by our

affectional preference.

Message Perception and Decoding. We know from numerous studies that have already been conducted that we attend to messages that serve our needs, whether these be needs to reduce dissonance, to gain ego gratification or to fill informational voids. Persons with different affectional preferences will obviously then focus on different message elements.

Contextual Differences. To say that much of gay and lesbian and straight communication occurs in different contexts is obvious to many and seems totally incorrect to others. Suffice it to say here that communication which is of a uniquely gay and lesbian nature occurs often in contexts that are almost unknown to the straight community. The discos, for example, are significantly different. The gay bars and the singles bars which are the nearest equivalent are likewise very different. But I am really thinking of the gay contexts for which the straight world does not have equivalents or at least not in most places; the baths is perhaps the clearest example. That the context influences the messages is obvious; what needs to be discovered is how this influence is exerted, what influence it has on the participants, and in what ways it influences the interpersonal interactions.

Subcultural Difference. There are so many obvious but nontrivial subcultural differences that it would be impossible to catalog them all. That many gays operate on a different clock is perhaps the clearest example of subcultural differences. The gay male or lesbian who has lived the life of a heterosexual and who enters the gay world at middle age will surely experience culture shock if only for the difference in time treatments. Actually, this differential time treatment is more accurately a subcultural variation within the homosexual subculture.

There are also important differences in ethical standards. Many would have us believe that the gay and lesbian community operates without ethics, and from an outsider's point of view this is not an unreasonable assumption to make. But it is not an absence of ethical standards that governs gay and lesbian behaviors but rather different ethical standards. Concepts such as fidelity, cheating, pre-marital sex, dating, friendship, love, and so many others are often given different definitions.

Field of Experience. The field of experience of gays and lesbians on the one hand and straights on the other differ greatly and it should be no surprise to find that when there is no commonality, there is no communication. Without some overlapping in our fields of experience we cannot communicate with any degree of effectiveness. Empathy, supportiveness, friendhip, and so many other variables will be influenced by the overlapping or non-overlapping of the fields of experience. And this is why it is so important for gays, lesbians, and straights who are friends to talk about their respective affectional preferences and each to educate the other. In this way there will be a sharing of the field of experience and meaningful communication may begin to take place.

Relational Development and Deterioration. Gay and lesbian relationships develop and deteriorate differently from straight relationships. Although we know little about heterosexual relationships, we know even less about homosexual relationships. But the differences between them are perhaps the most interesting. For example, the role of sex in the development of a relationship--whether gay, lesbian, or straight--will normally be very different. Similarly, the deterioration of a straight relationship, to its eventual dissolution and termination, will often be delayed or even prevented

because of the difficulties of divorce, child custody, alimony, parental pressure, societal pressure, religious beliefs, and the like. Gay and lesbian relationships, on the other hand, would probably terminate at a much earlier point in time because there are not these retarding factors. And this has given many the idea that gay and lesbian relationships are short lived. In one sense they are. But where there is a gay or lesbian relationship, it is usually a happy and mutually productive one. I am not sure that the same could be said of heterosexual relationships.

As administrators, teachers, writers, and researchers there are many actions that can be taken to ensure that the gay and lesbian student is accorded equal rights and that the interplay between affectional preference and communication is understood. The few suggestions and assumptions made here are not intended to be in any way definitive; rather, they are in the nature of preliminary thoughts which have yet to be worked out in detail.

Footnotes

I have been greatly aided in the writing of this papter by the comments and suggestions of those who read an earlier version: Daniel Ross Chandler, Rutgers University; James Chesebro, Temple University; Damien Martin, New York University; and Russel Windes, Queens College. These people, however, are not necessarily in agreement with or responsible for what is said here.

The following footnotes are intended not so much to document the assertions and arguments advanced here but rather to provide the interested but uninformed reader with some direction for his or her search through the widely scattered materials concerning the issues raised here.

[1]For a general overview of homosexuality, see, in addition to those references cited throughout the paper, C. A. Tripp, The Homosexual Matrix (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) and Martin Hoffman, The Gay World (New York: Basic Books, 1968). On the gay student see, for example, J. Lee Lehman, "Gay Students," in The Gay Academic, ed., Louie Crew (Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1978), pp. 57-63, and Barbara Gittings, "Combatting the Lies in the Libraries," The Gay Academic, pp. 107-118.

[2]For some idea of the conditions under which gay males live, see, for example, Howard Brown, Familiar Faces, Hidden Lives: The Story of Homosexual Men in America Today (New York: New American Library, 1976).

[3]If anyone doubts that problems confront the gay academic, Louie Crew's essay, "Before Emancipation: Gay Persons as Viewed by Chairpersons in English," in The Gay Academic, ed., Louie Crew (Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1978), pp. 3-48 will prove instructive.

[4]This concept of homophobia is crucial to an understanding of homosexuality and of homosexual oppression. On this see George Weinberg, Society and the Healthy Homosexual (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972) and Dennis Altman, Homosexual Oppression and Liberation (New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1971).

[5]On stereotypes see C. A. Tripp, The Homosexual Matrix (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) and William Masters and Virginia Johnson, Homosexuality in Perspective (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978).

[6]See, for example, Dennis Altman, Homosexual Oppression and Liberation (New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1971) for a view of the ways in which gays are oppressed by themselves as well as by others. For somewhat dated but still useful histories see, for example, for America, Donald Webster Cory, The Homosexual in America (New York: Greenberg, 1957) and, for Great Britain, H. Montgomery Hyde, The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name: A Candid History of Homosexuality in Britain (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970).

[7]That great strides have been made can perhaps best be appreciated from recalling that the Stonewall Riots occurred just ten years ago, on June 28, 1969. And this should be cause for pride. But there have been backlashes; there has been Anita Bryant "saving" children from homosexuals, John Briggs screaming to eliminate gay teachers, and religious leaders of all faiths condemning gays and lesbians to hell. And this should be cause for vigilance. Gains won today may be lost tomorrow. Complacency with the status quo is perhaps the worse possible danger.

[8]This issue of communication barriers is covered by Peter Fisher, The Gay Mystique: The Myth and Reality of Male Homosexuality (New York: Stein and Day, 1972).

[9]On the numbers of homosexuals see, for example, Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948; Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul Gebhard, Sexual Behavior in the Human Female (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953); William Masters and Virginia Johnson, Homosexuality in Perspective (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978).

[10]For a brief introduction see, for example, Vern and Bonnie Bullough, Sin, Sickness, and Sanity: A History of Sexual Attitudes (New York: New American Library, 1977). Louis Crompton, for example, has cogently argued that the term "genocide" is most appropriate in describing this oppression. "For a remarkable length of time--not less than 1400 years," says Crompton, "homosexual men and women in western society stood under a formal sentence of death, and were, in consequence, systematically killed or mutilated. But there has been no public account of this astonishing crime against humanity, all but unparalleled in its relentless use of sanctified legal traditions, and in its continuance century after century." See Crompton's "Gay Genocide: From Leviticus to Hitler," in The Gay Academic, ed., Louie Crew (Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1978), pp. 67-91.

[11]A useful source in this connection is Jonathan Katz, ed., Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the USA (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1976). Also see Hans Licht, Sexual Life in Ancient Greece (London: Abbey Library, 1932) and Otto Kiefer, Sexual Life in Ancient Rome (London: Abbey Library, 1934).

[12]On homosexuality as a creative force see John Murphy, Homosexual Liberation: A Personal View (New York: Praeger, 1971).

[13]Pertinent to this discussion is The Gay Academic, ed., Louis Crew (Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1978).

[14]It is pertinent to note that many of the leading textbook publishers have prepared guidelines to assist their authors and editors in avoiding sexism and in creating positive sexual and racial images. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Macmillan, McGraw-Hill, Wiley, and Harper & Row, for example, have published relatively extensive guidelines setting forth their position on these issues. Harper & Row, McGraw-Hill, and Wiley concentrate solely on women. Holt, Rinehart and Winston--in the shortest of these guides--in addition to covering women and sexism also focuses on race, ethnic or national origin, age, religion, and physical condition. Macmillan likewise covers racial and national minorities as well as women and sexism. In none of these publications, however, is the problem of the gay and lesbian addressed. Nowhere is the author or editor advised to or given guidelines in avoiding homosexual and lesbian stereotypes or in creating positive images for the gay and lesbian. But more to the point is that not one of these publishers--and I take these five to be a fair and representative sampling--has yet chosen to take a stand on the treatment of the gay and lesbian in educational materials.

[15]See Evelyn Hooker, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," in The Problem of Homosexuality in Modern America, ed., Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1963), pp. 141-161, for a classic study on the positive adjustment of homosexuals. For more recent evidence and argument see, for example, Mark Freedman, Homosexuality and Psychological Functioning (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1971) and "Towards a Gay Psychology," in The Gay Academic, ed., Louie Crew (Palm Springs, California: ETC Publications, 1978), pp. 315-326. Contrast these with, for example, one of the most famous studies on the psychological adjustment or rather maladjustment of the

homosexual conducted by Irving Bieber et al., Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study (New York: Basic Books, 1962). In this study--a study that has for years been considered the definitive study of homosexuals and their psychological adjustment--not one real live homosexual was examined. Instead Bieber and his colleagues studied questionnaires that were administered to 77 psychoanalysts who reported on their 106 homosexual patients. From these questionnaires a number of conclusions about homosexuality were drawn, for example, that homosexuals had close binding mothers and hostile detached fathers and that homosexuals were noncompetitive, clinging children. This insight I owe to Damien Martin, New York University.

Also see George Weinberg, Society and the Healthy Homosexual (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972).

[16]For a start see, for example, Casey Miller and Kate Swift, Words and Women: New Language in New Times (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976); Robin Lakoff, Language and Woman's Place (New York: Harper & Row, 1975); and Barbara Westbrook Eakins and R. Gene Eakins, Sex Differences in Human Communication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978).

[17]Merle Miller, On Being Different: What It Means To Be a Homosexual (New York: Random House, 1971); Karla Jay and Allen Young, eds., Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation (New York: Douglas/Links, 1972); and Laud Humphreys, Out of the Closets: The Sociology of Homosexual Liberation (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

[18]On language see Joseph J. Hayes, "Gayspeak," OJS, 62 (October 1976), 256-266 and Bruce Rodgers, The Queen's Vernacular: A Gay Lexicon (San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books, 1972). For communication more generally see Edward William Delph, The Silent Community: Public Homosexual Encounters (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978).